

REMARKS

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated July 5, 2007, in which the Office Action issued a rejection of claims 1-13. In this response, Applicant has addressed the objection regarding the Figures, amended the claims, and responds to the present Office Action with detailed comments to overcome the rejections. Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be placed in a state of allowance. No new matter has been added.

A. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because "the present figures merely show reference numbers." The Examiner has requested that a "brief description" accompany the reference numbers that are not easily recognized.

Applicant respectfully submits that this is a relatively unique request, however as stated in MPEP 608.02(e) the Examiner determines the completeness and consistency of the drawings. Therefore, Applicant submits Replacement Drawings to address the deficiencies pointed out in the current Office Action.

B. Prior Art Rejections (35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,433,209 to Kurosawa (hereinafter referred to as "Kurosawa"). The Examiner also rejected dependent claims 2, 6, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa. We submit, however, that Kurosawa does not teach, describe or suggest the features of Applicant's newly amended claims.

Newly amended claim 1 recites an audio playback device interface for interface with an audio headset, the interface including a load in series between an audio output of a stereo headset driver of an audio playback device and a ground, where the load is configured to prevent the audio output from directly contacting a ground when a mono headset plug is inserted into the stereo headset driver of the audio playback device. Additionally, the remaining independent claims 3, 8, and 9

have been amended to include the limitation of a mono headset plug being inserted into the headset driver of the audio playback device.

The main difference between Applicant's recited invention and Kurosawa resides in the distinctive "load" that comprises the resistance, as described in Kurosawa and in Applicant's invention.

In Kurosawa, the load R_2 is used to divide the voltage source $+B$. For example, when a stereophonic headphone is plugged,

"the voltage of voltage source $+B$ is divided by R_7 , resistor R_2 and a DC resistor component of the load of the stereophonic headphone connected to movable contact S_R , and a sufficient increased potential is obtained at connecting point P. This increased potential is supplied to the base of transistor Q_1 through resistor R_5 , so that transistor Q_1 becomes conductive. Therefore, the L-channel signal and the R-channel signal are grounded through resistors R_4 and R_3 , respectively, without being mixed with each other" (see Kurosawa, col. 5, lines 58-68).

Thereafter, when a monaural headphone is plugged, "the voltage of voltage source $+B$ is divided by R_7 , resistor R_2 , and the potential at connecting point P... is decreased. With this decreased potential at connecting point P, transistor Q_1 becomes nonconductive and the R-channel signal from amplifier A_2 is supplied to the input of amplifier A_1 " (See Kurosawa, col. 6 lines 19-26).

On the other hand, in Applicant's invention, the load is used *to prevent audio output from directly contacting the ground when a mono headset plug is inserted into the stereo headset jack of the playback device*, as recited in each amended independent claim 1, 3, 8 and 9. Consequently, a mono headset used with a stereo playback device would not cause overheating or damage to the playback device.

Moreover, in Applicant's recited invention, the value of the resistance, i.e., the load, is equal to or greater than the minimum impedance or resistance that the headset driver is configured to drive (see, newly added claim 14). Therefore, if the

value of the resistance is too small, the audio output is still likely to be grounded and the current in the line will be significant, thereby damaging the playback device.

Furthermore, the effects of utilizing the load as described in Kurosawa and in Applicant's invention are markedly different. The load described in Kurosawa is used to divide the voltage source +B, then to decide the state of conductive or nonconductive state of the transistor Q₁. As a result, whether the R-channel signal will be mixed to L-channel signal or not will be decided according to the state of either conductivity or nonconductivity of the transistor Q₁. Kurosawa is entirely silent about how to protect the device by utilizing the load. In further contrast, in Applicant's invention, the load is used to prevent audio output from directly contacting the ground when a mono headset plug is inserted into the stereo headset jack of the playback device.

Additionally, the value of Applicant's "load" and the "load" as disclosed in Kurosawa are wholly and patentably distinct. Kurosawa nowhere mentions anything about limiting the value of the resistance R₂ (load), and nothing is described about insuring that the value of the resistance R₂ will be low. Therefore, there is no indication that the playback device will not be damaged if the value of the resistance R₂ does happen to be extremely low. However, in Applicant's invention, as recited in newly amended claim 14, the value of the load is thus limited so that the value of the resistance is equal to or greater than the minimum impedance or resistance that headset driver is configured to drive. Therefore, the playback device will not be damaged because the audio output is grounded. Consequently, Kurosawa fails to teach any of the aforementioned features as recited in Applicant's independent claims.

Similarly, in view of the previously discussed shortcomings of Kurosawa to disclose the "load" elements as recited in Applicant's claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Kurosawa neither anticipates nor renders obvious any of Applicant's claims.

Consequently, the dependent claims 2, 4-7, and 10-15 each include, by way of their dependencies, *inter alia*, all the limitations of the independent claims 1, 3, 8, and 9. To establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection, the Examiner's cited art must teach or suggest all claim limitations. Since none of the independent claims are

anticipated nor rendered unpatentable by Kurosawa, Applicant submits that all of its dependent claims overcome these prior art rejections. Therefore, Kurosawa does not describe or suggest the features of claims 1-15.

C. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, allowance of all pending claims 1-15 is respectfully requested. If necessary, applicant requests, under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application and to charge the fees for a large entity under 37 CRFR 1.17(a). The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) or credit any overpayment(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-3001 of Kyocera Wireless Corp.

Respectfully Submitted;

Dated: September 20, 2007

/George W. Luckhardt/
George W. Luckhardt
Reg. No. 50,519

George W. Luckhardt
Kyocera Wireless Corp.
Attn: Patent Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Tel: (858) 882-2593
Fax: (858) 882-2485